

District Construction Engineer's Monthly Meeting
October 29, 2010 8:30 AM
Video Conference

Attendees:

D1 – Jon Sands, Terry Muse, Scott Presson, Michael Schulte
D2 – Tim Ruelke, Michael Sandow, Kenneth Cheek
D3 – Steve Benak, Keith Hinson, Renae Sanders, Faye McBroom
D4 – Pete Nissen, Pat McCann, Elisabeth Hassett
D5 – Frank O'Dea, Jonathan Duazo, Lorie Wilson, Jennifer Taylor, Taleb Shams
D6 – Mark Croft, Mario Cabrera, Ivan Hay, Erik Padron
D7 – Brian McKishnie, Conrad Campbell, John Simpson
TP – Matt Price, Bill Sears, Kurt Stone
CO – Paul Steinman, Larry Ritchie, Alan Autry, Jeff Caster, Freddy Andrade, Jerry Rudd, Nancy Aliff, Steve Carter, Calvin Johnson, Ananth Prasad, Carla Perry
FHWA- Rafiq Darji

New Business:

- 1) Landscaping Requirements* – (David Sadler/Paul Steinman/Jeff Caster)

Jeff Caster shared concerns expressed by the Landscape Architects related to the "establishment period" of specification 580. A proposal to eliminate the establishment period by including this period as part of the original contract time on stand-alone landscape projects was discussed. Jeff will take the lead on developing a special provision or developmental specification to be used on these stand-alone landscape projects as a "pilot" so as to evaluate performance of the specification. The group was polled to determine which districts are including landscaping as part of the roadway projects vs. solely letting stand-alone landscape projects. D2 shared an example of a stand-alone landscape project wherein the contractor failed to adequately maintain the landscaping during the establishment period and most if not all the landscaping either died or was not acceptable at the end of the establishment period. D7 proposed development of a "value added" specification for use on stand-alone landscape projects and on those projects where the landscaping is included as part of the roadway construction project. The group also discussed a proposal of withholding retainage for the landscaping items at final acceptance and issuing final payment in quarterly installments based on the contractor's performance during the establishment period. Extending the establishment period an additional year was not favored due to the fact that the contractor's would need to hold their bond open.

- 2) 580-5 Landscape Warranty/Maintenance Bonds* – (Paul Steinman)

580-5 Plant Establishment Period and Contractor's Warranty

Provide a Warranty/Maintenance Bond to the Department in the amount of the total sums bid for all landscape items as evidence of warranty during this plant establishment period. The cost of the bond will not be paid separately, but will be included in the costs of other bid items.

Link to a specification change which will be implemented July 2011

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/specificationoffice/Implemented/WorkBooks/History/Jul11/Files/5800500.impl.pdf>

The group discussed current issues related to warranty/maintenance bonds. The issue centers on the need for standardized language. Districts are to submit to Jerry Rudd current warranty/maintenance bonds being used. Jerry will review these and develop a standardized bond. Raised awareness of the specification change which will be implemented in July 2011.

- 3) Specification Changes requiring SCO approval – (Paul Steinman)

Link to CPAM 7.3.6.3

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/Manuals/cpam/New%20Clean%20Chapters/Chapter7s3.pdf>

Prior authorization from the Director, Office of Construction shall be obtained before implementing any changes to contract specifications on all contracts (including District let contracts).

It was noted that process reviews performed by SCO have disclosed instances where SCO approval has not been obtained prior to initiating specification changes. The districts were reminded to seek SCO approval for all specification changes on active construction contracts. This is interpreted to include incorporating existing approved specifications into active construction projects since the incorporation of that specification constitutes a change to the specifications governing the contract.

4) Delegation of Signature Authority for SA's and UP's – Re: CPAM 7.3.14(A)(2) – (Alan Autry)

Link to CPAM 7.3.14

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/Manuals/cpam/New%20Clean%20Chapters/Chapter7s3.pdf>

(2) Only the Secretary of Transportation can delegate authority for approval and execution of **Supplemental Agreements** and **Unilateral Payments**. That authority is delegated as follows:

a. For contract changes up to \$150,000, all **Supplemental Agreement** and **Unilateral Payment documents** shall be approved by the Resident Engineer and shall be executed by the District Construction Engineer ;

b. For contract changes more than \$150,000 and up to \$500,000, all **Supplemental Agreement and Unilateral Payment documents** shall be approved and executed by the District Construction Engineer; and

c. For contract changes more than \$500,000.00, all **Supplemental Agreement** and **Unilateral Payment documents** shall be approved and executed by the Director of Transportation Operations, except as follows, the District Construction Engineer may execute these **Supplemental Agreement and Unilateral Payment documents** after the Director of Transportation Operations has approved a draft copy of that **Supplemental Agreement or Unilateral Payment** showing the language and terms to be used.

The above limits apply regardless of whether the amount is an increase or decrease to the contract.

F.S. 337.11(9)(a) addresses this as follows:

(9)(a) The department shall permit the use of written supplemental agreements, written work orders pursuant to a contingency pay item or contingency supplemental agreement, and written change orders to any contract entered into by the department. Any supplemental agreement shall be reduced to written contract form and executed by the contractor and the department. Any supplemental agreement modifying any item in the original contract must be approved by the head of the department, or his or her designee, and executed by the appropriate person designated by him or her.

It was noted that during process reviews performed by SCO, SA's & UP's have been "approved" or "executed" by individuals other than the individual identified in CPAM 7.3.14 as having signature authority. The Districts were reminded to follow the signature requirements of this section. In the event the designated individual is not available to approve or execute the document, up-ward delegation of signature authority should occur. For example, on SA's valued \$150,000 or less, if the RE is unavailable to "approve" the SA, then the SA should be sent to the DCE to approve. This requirement applies if the RE is out of the office and has a signature delegation in effect for another individual in the Resident Office.

5) Reviews of Monthly Periodic Previous Payment Certification form and notices of non-payment by sub/suppliers. CPAM requires investigation into the legitimacy of identified withholding of payment noted on certifications. Spec. requirements and CPAM requirement to withhold monthly estimates. – (David Sadler/Paul Steinman)

Link to CPAM 6.1

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/Manuals/cpam/New%20Clean%20Chapters/Chapter6s1.pdf>

(A) Resident Level Responsibilities

Upon receipt of unpaid bill notice, the Resident Engineer will send a letter as shown in Guidance Documents for this section, including a copy of the unpaid bill claim, to the prime Contractor, initiating an investigation into the claim. The Resident Engineer will send a copy of the letter and claim to the District Final Estimates Manager (DFEM). The Resident Engineer will investigate any good cause of nonpayment. If the Resident Engineer considers that good cause is demonstrated then progress payments will continue. A good cause is when the prime Contractor and the subcontractor/supplier have a legitimate dispute as to whether or not the money is due and the prime Contractor is only withholding the amount in dispute. The Resident Engineer is not to decide the dispute or determine who might win the dispute. The Resident Engineer must only determine whether a legitimate dispute exists. However, if the Resident Engineer considers that good cause is not demonstrated then the next progress estimate will be withheld. During the investigation, progress payments will continue. The Project Administrator / Resident Engineer shall coordinate their review with the DFEM and the State Construction Office throughout the duration of the investigation.

If a monthly certification is not received and good cause for the same is not demonstrated, the Resident Engineer will notify the District Construction Engineer who will then determine whether to withhold payment of the next progress estimate.

(B) District Level Responsibilities

The District Final Estimate Manager (DFEM) will record any unpaid bill claim into the tracking system.

Section 337.11(11)(c), **Florida Statutes** states:

The department shall document and monitor claims of nonpayment of prime contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers. The claims shall be submitted to the department in writing, and the department shall maintain, in a central file, a record of each claim, specifying the claimant and the nature and the resolution of the claim.

The Districts were reminded to follow the requirements of this section and statute by investigating, monitoring and documenting unpaid bill claims and for recording any unpaid bill claims in the tracking systems.

6) SCO Customer Satisfaction Survey – (David Sadler)

This item was tabled until the next DCE monthly meeting.

7) Synertech ITS Pull Boxes – (Matt Price)

The Turnpike has experience recent failures of these boxes. It appears at this time this is an isolated instance, since no other districts reported failures. Boxes are currently being tested. As additional information becomes available as a result of these tests, that information will be shared as appropriate.

8) Buy America compliance on ITS projects – (Lorie Wilson)

Buy America requirements related to ITS projects were discussed. Buy America provisions are applicable to ITS projects provided the materials in question meet the requirements of CFR 635.410 and specification 6-5.2 and those requirements are applicable to the project (i.e. Federally Funded projects). If these conditions are met, ITS items/devices which contain permanently incorporated steel or iron (wholly or as a component) materials should be manufactured in the U.S. CFR 635.410 allows for “minimal use of foreign steel and iron materials” as follows:

4) When steel and iron materials are used in a project, the requirements of this section do not prevent a minimal use of foreign steel and iron materials, if the cost of such materials used does not exceed one-tenth of one percent (0.1 percent) of the total contract cost or \$2,500, whichever is greater. For purposes of this paragraph, the cost is that shown to be the value of the steel and iron products as they are delivered to the project.

The department is required to track "exceptions" and the tracking system established in SiteManager should be used to fulfill this requirement (refer to David Sadler's email issued 11/25/2009). If, as of 11/25/2009, the districts were using other methods to track these exceptions, those methods should continue to be used until those projects which were active at that time are completed. For all projects let after that date, the tracking system in SiteManager should be used.

9) Monitoring of Specification 7-27 (Preference to State Residents) – (Lorie Wilson)

Link to SP0072700 effective September 2010

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.fl.us/LTS/CO/Specifications/WorkBook/Jul2010/SP0072700.pdf>

**LEGAL REQUIREMENTS AND RESPONSIBILITY TO THE PUBLIC –
PREFERENCE TO STATE RESIDENTS.
(REV 6-15-10) (9-10)**

SECTION 7 (Pages 56 – 80) is expanded by the following new Article:

7-27 Preference to State Residents.

Chapter 2010-147, Section 50, Laws of Florida, providing for preference to residents of the State of Florida, is hereby made a part of this Contract:

Each contract that is funded by state funds must contain a provision requiring the contractor to give preference to the employment of state residents in the performance of the work on the project if state residents have substantially equal qualifications to those of nonresidents.

As used in this Section, the term "substantially equal qualifications" means the qualification of two or more persons among whom the employer cannot make a reasonable determination that the qualifications held by one person are better suited for the position than the qualifications held by the other person or persons.

The districts were reminded that the requirements of this section became effective July 1, 2010 (State-funded projects only). While the above specification was implemented with the September 2010 letting, District and Central Office Contracts Administration included this requirement as part of the Bid Solicitation Notice of all state funded project advertisements let in July and August 2010. This is a self-regulating requirement.

10) Recording of Meetings – (Scott Presson)

Districts are seeking guidance on recording of various project meetings (i.e. pre-cons, progress meetings, etc.) and whether or not those meetings should be handled as "public meetings". A proposal has been drafted and submitted to Brian Blanchard. Ananth indicated that the primary objective is to insure that meeting attendees are notified in advance of the meeting that the meeting will be recorded. Ananth also indicated that it is not necessary to treat these project meetings as "public meetings". Calvin Johnson will discuss this issue with Bruce Conroy. Paul Steinman will present a draft e-mail to Bruce for review and approval. Final direction is expected to go out to the districts following a meeting with General Counsel which will occur on 11/19/2010.

11) Time allowable between milling and resurfacing. Contractors are requesting between one & three days before having to pave back a milled surface. – (Scott Presson)

This topic was discussed at the recent Henry Fuller Task team. A proposal to modify the requirements of specification 327 is under review by SCO.

- 12) Spec 7-11.4. Contractors are requesting compensation for traffic signs, signal equipment, highway lighting and guardrail if installed and then damaged beyond their control. – (Scott Presson)

Link to specification change effective January 2011

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.fl.us/LTS/CO/Specifications/WorkBook/Jan2011/SS0070104.pdf>

SUBARTICLE 7-11.4 (Page 67) is deleted as the following is substituted:

7-11.4 Traffic Signs, Signal Equipment, Highway Lighting and Guardrail: Protect all existing roadside signs, signal equipment, highway lighting and guardrail, for which permanent removal is not indicated, against damage or displacement. Whenever such signs, signal equipment, highway lighting or guardrail lie within the limits of construction, or wherever so directed by the Engineer due to urgency of construction operations, take up and properly store the existing roadside signs, signal equipment, highway lighting and guardrail and subsequently reset them at their original locations or, in the case of widened pavement or roadbed, at locations designated by the Engineer.

If the Department determines that damage to such **existing traffic signs**, signal equipment, highway lighting or guardrail is caused by a third party(ies), and is not otherwise due to any fault or activities of the Contractor, the Department will, with the exception of any damage resulting from vandalism, compensate the Contractor for the costs associated with the repairs. Repair damage caused by vandalism at no expense to the Department.

Payment for repairs will be in accordance with 4-3.4.

This topic was discussed at the recent Henry Fuller Task team. Requests for compensation for damage to those items previously installed by the contractor contract should be denied. The exceptions are those identified in specification 102-13.12.1, Basis of Payment (for Redirective Temporary Vehicular Impact Attenuators) and specification 544-4, Compensation (for restoring damaged attenuators). Payment for restoring damage to those items is limited to the invoice price for new materials or parts plus 20% mark-up. Raised awareness of the specification change which will be implemented in July 2011. The specification change does not alter the interpretation of this specification which has been discussed in previous DCE meetings.

- 13) Contractors request to simplify asphalt work. One idea is to eliminate the CPF. We could also eliminate spread rate calculations and cores for thickness (or use GPR or other technology to determine thickness). – (Scott Presson)

This topic was discussed at the recent Henry Fuller Task team. Frank O'Dea indicated that at the HFTT meeting, Industry would strongly oppose elimination of the CPF. Paul Steinman will follow-up with David Chason on using roadway cores as the basis for payment. This has been discussed at previous DCE meetings and David Chason is analyzing data provided by the districts.

- 14) Request to change CPAM to allow the Construction Assistant to the Operations Center Engineer (OCE) to sign letters that currently only the OCE can sign (examples: Weather Letters, Final Acceptance, etc.). – (Scott Presson)

The group discussed a proposal to modify CPAM to allow the assistant to the OCE over Construction projects (i.e. Engineering Manager) in those districts with using the Operations Center concept sign certain documents. Those districts using the Operations Center concept were polled and overall agreed with this change. SCO will review CPAM and incorporate changes to this process as appropriate. Those districts using the Operations Center concept should send the title of the individual being proposed to Alan Autry. Note: any change will not apply to the documents discussed in item 4 above.

- 15) Shorts allowed for Construction Inspectors – (Scott Presson)

The districts were polled to determine which districts currently allow Construction Inspectors to wear shorts while performing their duties on active construction projects. Currently no districts

allow this. It was mentioned that if this proposal were to gain momentum, Industry would express concerns due to potential liability issues. Paul Steinman will follow-up on this item and provide an update to the group.

- 16) Need for CPAM to address schedule review and ~~approval~~ acceptance. Discuss Best Practices used by Districts to review and obtain both an acceptable baseline schedule and acceptable updates. – (Scott Presson)

Link to CPAM 2.1.5 and 2.1.7 which address original schedule and revised schedule requirements

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/Manuals/cpam/New%20Clean%20Chapters/Chapter2s1.pdf>

From: Presson, Scott
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2010 11:19 AM
To: Autry, Alan
Subject: RE: 10/29/2010 DCE Meeting Agenda

Alan,

To avoid any confusion and wasted work time, I wanted to clarify our request for CPAM to address schedule review and acceptance (Agenda Item 16).

We would like to CPAM 2.1 to further clarify the following:

- Activity Durations appear reasonable – Is the direction to reject the schedule on concerns over activity durations if we believe them to be unachievable (previous production rates, current work crews on-site, etc)? The concern is that the schedule is in fact the Contractor's submitted schedule and we cannot control their future production. We discuss our concerns but are unsure if there is justification for rejection.
- At some point, delays in work progress will cause a project to be unable to be completed within Allowable Contract Time. Per Specification and CPAM, the indication is not to accept a Schedule Update if completion is shown after allowable contract time. This causes the Department to not accept schedule updates for projects that cannot finish within contract time or are already in LD's. Thus, we have a project going forward without an acceptable schedule to monitor the work. Should we consider accepting schedules in which completion is shown beyond allowable contract time?

We were also simply looking for any best practices from other Districts in regards to obtaining acceptable baseline schedules and update schedules.

Thanks for your time and consideration to this request.

Scott Presson, P.E.
District 1 Construction Services Manager
Florida Department of Transportation
801 N. Broadway Ave.
Bartow, FL 33830
Office: 863.519.2228
Fax: 863.534.0071

The information above was discussed and is currently under review by SCO. Richard Massey will review and make any changes to CPAM and the specifications as appropriate. If the districts have established "best practices" they would like to share, send those to Alan Autry.

- 17) Resolution Tracking System – Interest of other districts to use the system to track all issues resulting in change orders, not just those coded as Avoidable – 1. – (Scott Presson)

A proposal for entering all contract modifications coded as "avoidable" into the RTS was discussed. All districts were polled and none support moving in this direction. A concern over the functionality of the RTS was discussed. The DCE's would like to discuss this further with Brian Blanchard.

- 18) Resistance from Production Offices to implement a revision to the plan set during advertisement when a pre-bid question identifies an error in the plan set. – (Scott Presson)

A concern over reluctance by the Production Office to issue contract addenda when issues are identified via a bidders pre-bid question was discussed. It was noted that the pre-bid Q&A site is not intended to be used to circumvent the addenda process. It was suggested that Ananth address this with the District Production directors.

- 19) Thermoplastic Situation. Contractors continue to claim a shortage related to thermoplastic. Currently, there is only one vendor on the QPL for audible yellow thermoplastic. Are other districts experiencing contractor inability to have the audible thermo provided to their jobs?– (Scott Presson)

The districts were polled to gauge on-going effects this issue is causing. D5 has delayed issuance of the NTP or removed the thermoplastic work from the contract in certain cases. D6 has a pending issue which is currently under review. D7 has experienced issues and has had project specific impacts. TP, who handles thermoplastic placement via Maintenance contracts, has also delay issuance of the NTP on certain projects. In these cases, the contactor has demonstrated impacts beyond their control in spite of mitigation efforts which have impacted their ability to obtain the material when it is needed.

- 20) Is the Department working on an agreement between the State of Florida and other states concerning the recognition of other states Construction Engineering Inspection Qualification Programs? – (Renae Sanders)

From: Collins, Yvonne
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2010 11:28 AM
To: Autry, Alan
Cc: Rudd, Jerry; Perry, Carla M.
Subject: RE: 10/29 DCE Meeting - Agenda Items

Not at this time. We are not offering reciprocity of other states Construction Qualifications. We do offer reciprocity for attainment of ACI Certifications obtain in other states.

Yvonne Collins
State Construction Training Administrator
(850) 414-4141 (Office)
(850) 412-8021 (Fax)

At this time there are no plans to expand recognition of certifications or qualifications issued by other States other than the reciprocity related to the ACI certification mentioned above.

- 21) Has a decision been made concerning payment of “Negotiated” or “Actual” rates for Consultant Construction Engineer Inspection (CCEI) contracts? – (Renae Sanders)

From: Hinson, Keith
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2010 11:32 AM
To: Benak, Steve; Caballero, Eduardo; Croft, Mark; Darji, Rafiq; Harris, Jeannette A; Hinson, Keith; Malerk, Tom; McCann, Patrick; McKishnie, Brian M; Muse, Terry; Nissen, Pete; O'Dea, Frank; Presson, Scott; Price, Matthew; Ruelke, Timothy; Sands, Jon; Sears, William; Taylor, Jennifer; Thompson, Chad; Wilson, Lorie; Autry, Alan
Subject: CCEI Negotiation Summary

Summary of Consultant CEI Negotiations State-Wide

D1- actual rates are submitted, Professional Services negotiates fair & reasonable rates
D2- pays actual rates if budget allows
D3- negotiates rates
D4- pays actual rates if budget allows, CCEI must reduce salaries or operating margin to fit budget
D5- negotiates rates
D6- pays actual rates as long as the rate falls within the range for actual rates district wide
D7- pays actual rates as long as the rate falls within the range for actual rates district wide
TP- pays actual rates as long as the rate falls within the range for actual rates district wide

Keith Alan Hinson P.E.
Assistant Construction Services & Support Engineer
(850) 415-9617

Ananth addressed this subject with the group stressing that the objective is to consistently address how CCEI contracts are paid. The DCE's were encouraged to coordinate with their respective Professional Services Unit to discuss the district's current practice and to review Professional Services procedures governing this process so as to prepare for a state-wide meeting which will be set up to discuss this further. Previously Keith Hinson developed a summary which outlines how each district handles this process. That summary was provided to the group following the meeting. Jerry Rudd is scheduling the meeting.

- 22) Is the Department working toward establishing an agreement between the State of Florida and our neighboring states concerning Disadvantage Business Enterprise (DBE) reciprocity? – (Renae Sanders)

From: Wright, Arthur
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2010 11:30 AM
To: Autry, Alan
Subject: RE: 10/29 DCE Meeting - Agenda Items

Alan,

Florida is one of 8 states (others are Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Kentucky) that belong to a group called the Southern Transportation Civil Rights Executive Council. This group has discussed reciprocity in the past, but never received enough support. The individuals in the group have changed since the last discussion about this issue, so I will bring it up again at our next meeting that is scheduled for next Thursday.

Thanks and let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

Art Wright, Manager
Equal Opportunity Office
Florida Department of Transportation
(850) 414-4749
arthur.wright@dot.state.fl.us

At this time, there is no effort underway to create a DBE reciprocity agreement with neighboring states. Prior to the DCE meeting, Art Wright participated in a meeting with the seven other states identified in the email above. During that meeting no other state expressed any interest in participating in DBE reciprocity. Art has indicated that when the department is evaluating a DBE applicant who is already approved in another state greater flexibility is exercised when evaluating the application. Pete Nissen expressed a concern with all of the information included in the DBE certification form. Pete will provide additional information to SCO for review.

23) Precast barrier on moment slab discussion – (David Sadler/Paul Steinman)

The districts were informed that they may be approached by contractors to approve the use of a TL-4 Full Precast Traffic Barrier (FPTB) manufactured by MSE Systems, Inc. on active conventional and design-build projects. The districts were reminded that currently there are no FPTB items on the QPL. Any requests for use of this product should be submitted to the District & State Structures Design Offices for review prior to approval via the shop drawing submittal process. At this time, no blanket approval for this type of product has been granted by the department.

24) Numbering of work/change orders in SiteManager (consistency) – (Lorie Wilson)

Link to CPAM 7.3

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/Manuals/cpam/New%20Clean%20Chapters/Chapter7s3.pdf>

CPAM 7.3.14 (a):

*On contracts using the SiteManager program, **Supplemental Agreements** and **Unilateral Payments** will incorporate the same numbering system used for the SiteManager program contract modification number. No **Unilateral Payment** shall have the same number as a **Supplemental Agreement** or a **Contingency Supplemental Agreement** to that contract.*

CPAM 7.4.8.3 (a):

***Contingency Supplemental Agreements, Standard Supplemental Agreements** and **Unilateral Payments** will incorporate the same numbering system used for the SiteManager program contract modification number.*

CPAM 7.4.9.2 (a):

*The first **Work Order** authorizing additional work to be performed, or a contract change, against an executed **Contingency Supplemental Agreement, Form No. 700-010-79** or a **Contingency Pay Item** respectively shall be **Work Order No. 01**; the second **Work Order** authorizing additional work to be performed, or a contract change, against the same executed **Contingency Supplemental Agreement** or **Contingency Pay Item** shall be **Work Order No. 02**; etc. This numbering sequence shall be repeated with each **Contingency Supplemental Agreement** or **Contingency Pay Item**.*

Refer to the numbering instructions of form 700-010-80 Work Order for additional instructions:

<http://ombnet.co.dot.state.fl.us/forms/informs/70001080.pdf>

The group was polled to determine if the numbering requirements of CPAM and the numbering instructions on the Work Order form are currently being followed. D5 discussed an on-going pilot project in that district where Work Orders which include \$\$ for additional work but do not include time extensions are entered into the SiteManager change order system in addition to CCTS. This pilot will be reviewed by the SiteManager Coordinators at their next meeting scheduled for 11/10/2010.

25) Proposed Specification Change for Embedded Data Collectors – (David Sadler/Paul Steinman)

Based on the impending expiration of DCE Memo 05-10, a proposed specification is currently under development by the State Structures Design Office to address dynamic load testing requirements. The proposed specification will be drafted such that there will not be a specific requirement for EDC or PDA. Rather the specification will give the contractor the flexibility to select the method of dynamic load testing. The proposed specification change will be sent to the State & District Materials Offices for initial review.

* State and District Landscape Architects will be present for the discussion of these items

Walk-on Items:

1) Interstate Lane Closures – (Ananth Prasad)

Ananth shared a concern over extended periods of lane closures on interstate construction projects. He shared an example where a contractor was allowed to close the interstate and institute nightly (10 PM – 5 AM) detours for an extended period (3 months or longer). The districts were asked to send any current lane closure policies to Ananth and to coordinate extended interstate closures/detours with Central Office.

2) CSI Proposals – (Ananth Prasad)

Ananth shared concerns expressed by FICE that CSI proposals were being viewed as a direct reflection of plans quality. This is not the intent of the CSI process. The districts were reminded to encourage and evaluate CSI proposals since the process affords the opportunity to enhance performance, reduce costs, increase safety, etc.

3) Guardrail Reflectors – (Paul Steinman)

SCO has been informed of premature failures of guardrail reflectors assigned the following QPL numbers:

- S536-0110
- S536-0111

The manufacturer is aware that batches of failing reflectors have been produced and installed on certain FDOT projects and is willing to provide replacements. The QPL office has requested to manufacturer to provide the batch numbers and manufacturing dates to determine the extent of the affected product.

NEXT DCE MONTHLY MEETING – November 29, 2010